

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 were examined. No claims are cancelled. Claims 17, 20, and 21 are amended. Such amendments do not change the scope of the claims. Claims 22-50 are added. Examination and reconsideration of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview of December 30, 2003

Applicants thank the Examiner for the kind and courteous phone interview of December 30, 2003 between Examiner Gabor, Eric Karplus, and Craig Wong. In the phone interview Applicants discussed independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 20 relative to the cited references. Applicants noted that the cited references do not describe using charge separation to determine a position of incidence of radiation. The Examiner agreed that Rougeot et al. and the other cited references did not describe or suggest using charge separation, but no explicit agreement was reached. Applicants believe that the originally filed claims are allowable over the cited references.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants file herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS). To date, Applicants have not received an initialed copy of the IDS filed on January 31, 2002. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner expressly consider and initial the newly submitted references and the references cited in the original IDS filed on January 31, 2002 and that the references appear among the "references cited" on any patent that issues.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-14, 17, 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-14, 17, 18 as allegedly being anticipated by Rougeot et. al. (U.S. Patent 5,144,141). Such rejections are traversed as follows.

Original claim 1 recites an apparatus for determining the position of incidence of radiation. The apparatus comprises a solid-state device with internal gain and means for using charge separation to obtain electrical signals from said device in response to incidence of

Interview Summary OK
03-16-04